REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3 and 50 have been amended. Claim 3 has been amended merely to correct a typographical error, without affecting the scope or patentability of the claim. No new matter is being presented.

Claim 48 is canceled, and thus any rejections against claim 48 are submitted to be moot.

Claims 1-47 and 49-50 are pending and under consideration.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration as the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nozaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,998).

Nozaki seeks to address a problem in copying DVDs recorded in a file system standard (such as RTR-DVDs) experienced by the two standard copying methods. The standard copying methods may reduce the quality of the reproduced video due to multiple encodings, take longer amounts of time to copy or disregard copy protection information. To avoid these problems, Nozaki is directed to a DVD recording/reproducing apparatus with a high-speed copying capability in which video data is reproduced in every unit of video object unit VOBU, and checking of copy protection information is carried out for every VOBU in order to reduce errors in the copying process as well as making a copy operation reflecting the copy protection information of the disk.

In contrast, para. [0007] of the Specification describes copying data recorded on an optical recording medium, which is inserted into one disk drive, to an optical recording medium in another disk drive without needing a PC or a recording application program.

Claim 1 at least recites "communication lines directly between the transmitting and receiving optical recording medium." The Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "communication lines" as being equal to the connecting lines shown in FIG. 1 of Nozaki. Specifically, the Office Action states that the disc drives in FIG. 1 are connected through communication lines. However, As shown in FIG. 1 of Nozaki, the connection lines between the components in FIG. 1 do not include a connection directly between the 1st disc drive 21A and 2nd disc drive 21B. Rather, disc drive 21A connects to 1st D-Pro 19A or MPU 13, but is not connected to 2nd disc drive 21B. Thus, Nozaki fails to describe or suggest the claimed "communication lines directly between the transmitting and receiving optical recording medium."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 46 at least recites "a transmitting optical disc drive having a first copying button" and "a receiving optical disc drive in communication with the transmitting drive and having a second copying button."

The Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "first" and "second" copying buttons as being equal to the "copy-key" shown in the "press copy-key" label in FIG. 12 of Nozaki.

Applicant respectfully submits that as Nozaki merely shows pressing a "copy-key," that only one copy-key is included, the copy-key not being further associated with one disc drive or another. See FIG. 12 of Nozaki. Thus, Applicant submits that Nozaki fails to describe or suggest the claimed "first" and "second" copying buttons.

Further, the description of FIG. 12 in col. 11 of Nozaki does not describe or suggest the location of the copy-key, however, one of ordinary skill in the art may assume that the copy-key is located on the keyboard 22, the keyboard 22 being where the mark key, also shown in FIG. 12, is located. See Nozaki, col. 11, line 10. The keyboard 22, of Nozaki, is shown in FIG. 1 as being separate from 1st disc drive 21A and 2nd disc drive 21B, and has a connector line only to the main MPU 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that Nozaki fails to describe or suggest "a transmitting optical disc drive having a first copying button" or "a receiving optical disc drive in communication with the transmitting drive and having a second copying button," as the copy-key of Nozaki appears to be part of a keyboard, which is a separate component altogether from the 1st disc drive 21A and 2nd disc drive 21B of Nozaki.

Therefore, in view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claim 46 and claim 47 which depends therefrom and recites patentably distinct features of its own, patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 1, 46 and 47 are respectfully requested.

Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gehr (U.S.

Patent No. 6,453,395).

Gehr seeks to resolve a problem in copying CDs where a computer user becomes confused as a result of having to launch formatting software as well as the software that copies data from a content CD (master) to a blank CD. To resolve this problem, Gehr describes the launching of copy software to handle the formatting and copying of a CD when a copy button on a read/write compact disc drive is pressed. Further, Gehr describes that the user is prompted to take specific action in the copying process when the copy button is pressed. See Gehr, col. 1, lines 34-47.

Claim 49 at least recites:

> a transmitting optical disc drive transmitting data recorded on any optical recording disc type inserted in the transmitting optical disc drive to the receiving optical disc device, in response to the transmitting copying button activation.

The Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "transmitting data ... in response to the transmitting copying button activation," as being equal to the pressing of a copy button in Gehr. The Office Action states that "pressing the copy button causes the system to check the transmit drive for compatibility thus initiating the copy operation for the transmit drive," however, Applicant submits that even under this interpretation of Gehr, initiating a copy operation does not describe or suggest "transmitting data" as claimed. In contrast, as described in Gehr, at col. 3, lines 50-65, the operating system launches copy software in response to a copy button being pressed. However, Gehr does not describe that "transmitting data" occurs "in response to the transmitting copying button activation," as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 49 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 50 at least recites:

> A receiving optical disc device to communicate with a transmitting optical disc device that transmits data recorded on any optical recording disc type inserted in the transmitting optical disc device, the receiving optical disc device, comprising:
>
> a receiving copying button
>
> wherein when the receiving copying button is pressed, the receiving optical disc drive receives the data transmitted from the transmitting optical disc drive.

The Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "receiving copying button" with the copy button of Gehr. The Office Action states that "pressing the copy button causes the system to check the receive drive for compatibility, thus initiating the copy operation for the receive drive." Applicant respectfully submits that as the copy button in Gehr is described as causing the system to check the receive drive for compatibility, it does not describe or suggest "when the receiving copying button is pressed, the receiving optical disc drive receives the data transmitted from the transmitting optical disc drive," as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 50 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 49-50 are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 2-4, 6-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Ozawa et al. (Ozawa), U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2001/0033531.

Claim 2 at least recites "wherein the communication lines ... serially transmit the data recorded." The Office Action states that Nozaki fails to teach or describe this feature but that Ozawa cures this deficiency. Thus, the Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "communication lines ... serially transmit" as being equal to the description of the structure of a frame recorded on a disc having the CD format, as described in Ozawa in paras. [0181]-[0183].

Under the Office Action's apparent interpretation of Ozawa, the format of the frames in Ozawa includes synchronization data which may allow the frames to be written serially. However, even this interpretation of Ozawa does not describe or suggest "communication lines" and further, "communication lines ... serially transmit the data recorded."

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 2 distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 3 at least recites:

> a controller controlling transmission of the decoded disc related data recorded in the lead-in area and the decoded program area data recorded in the program area of the first optical recording medium to the receiving optical recording medium drive, controlling transmission of a signal to the receiving optical recording medium drive, when a copying key is pressed, the copying key installed outside the transmitting optical recording medium drive, and controlling transmission of a signal to the receiving optical recording medium drive indicating a state of the transmitting optical recording medium drive.

The Office Action only provides a citation to Ozawa at paras. [0125]-[0127] as teaching or describing the above claimed feature. Applicant submits that Ozawa at paras. [0125]-[0127] merely describes various keys on an operation unit, wherein information generated by the operation unit is supplied to a system controller. Thus, the Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "copying key" with the "dubbing key" of the operation unit of Ozawa and the claimed "controller" with the system controller of Ozawa.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dubbing key of Ozawa cannot be equated to the claimed "copying key." The dubbing key of Ozawa is described in para. [0125] of Ozawa as being operated to set ordinary-speed dubbing or high-speed dubbing, but is silent regarding what, if anything, happens when the dubbing key is set. Thus, Ozawa fails to describe "controlling transmission of a signal to the receiving optical recording medium drive, when a copying key is pressed," as claimed.

Further, the system controller of Ozawa, in para. [0127], is described as driving other components to carry out necessary operations by execution of an operating program in accordance with the operation information. However, no further description is provided, and specifically the claimed "controlling transmission of the decoded disc related data ...," "controlling transmission of a signal to the receiving optical recording medium drive ..." and "controlling transmission of a signal to the receiving optical recording medium drive indicating a state of the transmitting optical recording medium drive," is not described in the cited paras. [0125] and [0127].

Applicant further submits that Nozaki fails to cure the deficiency of Ozawa as Nozaki also does not describe or suggest at least the "copying key" and "controller." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Applicant further submits that claims 4, 6-13 and 16 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 3 from which they depend.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 2-4, 6-13 and 16 are respectfully requested.

Claims 27-30, 32-37 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehr in view of Ozawa.

Claim 27 at least recites:

> determining types of optical recording media when the optical recording media are inserted into the transmitting and receiving optical recording medium drives and a copying signal is input to both these drives;

The Office Action appears to be interpreting the above claimed features as being equal to FIGS. 7A-7G of Gehr. Specifically, although the Office Action appears to be interpreting reference numeral 700, FIG. 7A of Gehr as describing "determining types of optical recording media," Applicant respectfully submits that here, Gehr is merely describing whether or not media inserted into the disk drive is CD compatible or not. Applicant respectfully submits that a determination, such as described in Gehr of whether media is CD compatible or not, cannot be equal to "determining types of optical recording media," as claimed. In contrast, a determination is made in Gehr as to whether the media is CD compatible or not, but no determination is made as to the type of media.

Claim 27 further at least recites:

> determining types of optical recording media when the optical recording media are inserted into the transmitting and receiving optical recording medium drives and a copying signal is input to both these drives

The Office Action appears to be interpreting the above claimed feature as being described by Gehr in FIG. 4, reference numbers 400 and 402. Applicant respectfully submits that reference numbers 400 and 402 merely refer to the one button being pressed down and consequently copy software being launched. The user in Gehr is subsequently presented with different prompts to complete the copy process as described in column 3, lines 64-65, and therefore at the time in Gehr when the copy software is being launched, no commands are sent to the drives at least until after the user answers the prompts. Thus, Gehr fails to teach or suggest "a copying signal is input to both these drives" as recited in claim 27.

Claim 27 at least further recites:

> A method of copying an optical recording medium in an optical recording medium copying apparatus in which a transmitting optical recording medium drive operates when a predetermined power is applied to the transmitting drive and a receiving optical recording medium drive operates when a predetermined power is applied to the receiving drive and transmits or receives data using a communication line which is different from a communication line used by the transmitting optical recording medium drive, the method comprising:
>
> converting in the transmitting optical recording drive data recorded in a lead-in area and data recorded in a program area of the transmitting optical recording medium, into data for transmitting, and transmitting the converted data to the receiving optical recording medium drive;
>
> sequentially recording in the receiving optical recording medium drive received data transmitted by the transmitting optical recording medium drive in a lead-in area and a program area of the receiving optical recording medium, generating lead-out area

> data to be recorded in a lead-out area of the receiving optical recording medium, and recording the generated lead-out area data in the lead-out area.

The Office Action states that Gehr fails to describe or suggest the claimed "transmitting the converted data to the receiving optical recording medium drive," but states that Ozawa cures this deficiency. Thus, the Office Action appears to be interpreting the above described features as being described by FIGS. 9 and 16A-16E of Ozawa.

Applicant respectfully submits that FIG. 9 of Ozawa shows data included in a TOC recorded in a lead-in area of a playback only medium CD. Further, FIGS. 16A-16E show tables of cataloged data. In contrast, claim 27 recites that "a receiving optical recording medium drive ... receives data using a communication line which is different from a communication line used by the transmitting optical recording medium drive" which provides an antecedent basis for the claimed "transmitting the converted data to the receiving optical recording medium drive" in that the claimed "transmitting" uses a communication line different than the communication line used by the receiving optical recording medium.

Therefore, as Ozawa merely describes data included in a TOC and tables of cataloged data, Ozawa fails to describe or suggest wherein the "transmitting ... to the receiving optical recording medium drive," and "received data transmitted by the transmitting optical recording medium drive" is done "using a communication line which is different from a communication line used by the transmitting optical recording medium drive," as claimed.

Applicant further submits that Gehr fails to cure this deficiency. Thus, in view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 and claims 28-30, 32-37 and 44 which depend therefrom and recite patentably distinct features of their own, distinguish over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 27-30, 32-37 and 44 are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 31, 38-40, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,998) in view of Ozawa et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033531) and further in view of Gehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,395).

Applicant respectfully submits that Gehr fails to cure the above mentioned deficiencies regarding Nozaki and Ozawa as applied to claim 3 from which claim 5 depends. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Gehr fails to cure the above mentioned deficiencies regarding Nozaki and Ozawa as applied to claim 27 from which claims 31, 38-40, 43 and 45 depend. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 27, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31, 38-40, 43 and 45 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 5, 31, 38-40, 43 and 45 are respectfully requested.

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki and Ozawa and further in view of Denda et al. (Denda), U.S. Patent No. 6,995,936.

Applicant respectfully submits that Denda fails to cure the above mentioned deficiencies regarding Nozaki and Ozawa as applied to claim 3 from which claims 14 and 15 depend. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 15 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 14 and 15 are respectfully requested.

Claims 17-26 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozaki and further in view of Ozawa and Gehr and Denda.

Claim 17 at least recites "a controller controlling sequential recording of the received converted data." The Office Action states that Nozaki fails to teach or describe this feature but that Ozawa cures this deficiency. On page 11, the Office Action appears to be interpreting the claimed "sequential recording" as being equal to the description of tracks Tr1 to Tr5 on a CD being played back sequentially in a track-number order, as described in Ozawa in para. [0016].

However, in para. [0016] of Ozawa, only the sequential playback of tracks in a track-number order is described. Thus, Ozawa fails to describe or suggest "sequential recording of the received data," as claimed.

Further, Gehr and Denda fail to cure the abovementioned deficiency regarding Nozaki and Ozawa.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 17 and claims 18-26 which depend therefrom and recite patentably distinct features of their own, patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Applicant submits that Nozaki and Denda fail to cure the abovementioned deficiencies regarding Gehr and Ozawa as they are applied to claim 27. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 27 from which claims 41 and 42 depend, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 41 and 42 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Favorable reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejection against claims 17-26 and 41-42 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6/19/08

By: Michelle M. Koeth
Michelle M. Koeth
Registration No. 60,707

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501